



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/539,459

04/06/2006

Peter Kwasny

13441/1

8389

26646

7590

12/04/2008

KENYON & KENYON LLP
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

NICHOLS II, ROBERT K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3754

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/04/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/539,459	Applicant(s) KWASNY, PETER	
	Examiner ROBERT K. NICHOLS II	Art Unit 3754	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/09/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5, 8-22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kwasny (WO 02/076852).

Regarding claim 1, Kwasny discloses a pressurized can including a body 2, a dome 3 accommodating a valve 4, a concavely shaped bottom 5, an inner casing 7 attached to a cup 6, a push rod 9 arranged in the inner casing 7, the push rod 9 being actuated through the cup 6 and intended to force open the inner casing 7, with the inner casing 7 being joined to the cup 6 via a spring cage 11, the spring cage 11 containing a spring-loaded trigger 12 which acts on the push rod 9 which, in turn, acts on a cover 8 arranged at the can-side end of the inner casing 7, characterized in that the cover 8 is a membrane which seals the inner casing 7 at its can-side end hermetically against the contents of the pressurized can 1 and which is torn or split open by the push rod 9 when the trigger 12 is actuated (see figures 1-6).

Regarding claim 5, Kwasny discloses a second membrane 15 being arranged in the transition area from the inner casing 7 to the receptacle 18 (see figure 2).

Regarding claim 8, Kwasny discloses the inner casing 7 being arranged on a cup 6 located in the bottom 5 of the pressurized can 1 (see figures 1 and 2).

Regarding claim 9, Kwasny discloses the cup 6 with the inner casing 7 being arranged in the dome 2 of the pressurized can 1 (see figures 1 and 2).

Regarding claim 10, Kwasny discloses the trigger 12 being provided with a receptacle 33 for a trigger pin 14 or a spray head (see figure 6).

Regarding claim 11, Kwasny discloses the inner casing 7 being secured to the cup 6 arranged in the bottom 5 of the can 1 and is provided with an attached membrane 8 (see figure 1).

Regarding claim 12, Kwasny discloses the inner casing 7 and the cup 6 being joined together by crimping (see figure 2 and page 4 of translation).

Regarding claim 13, Kwasny discloses the spring cage 11 being fixed in a central pocket 19 of the cup 6 (see figure 2).

Art Unit: 3754

Regarding claim 14, Kwasny discloses the push rod 9 being provided with several wings 17 along a central axis (see figure 2).

Regarding claim 15, Kwasny discloses the push rod 9 having the shape of a sloped and sharp-edged hollow cylinder 16 at its can-side end (see figure 2).

Regarding claim 16, Kwasny discloses the wings 17 are provided with cut-outs and/or recesses (see figure 2).

Regarding claim 17, Kwasny discloses a seal 20 being arranged between the spring cage 11 and the cup 6 in the area of the central pocket 19 (see figure 2).

Regarding claim 18, Kwasny discloses the spring cage 11 being provided, at its valve-side end, with an internal projection 21 acting as an abutment for a spring element 13 (see figure 2).

Regarding claim 19, Kwasny discloses the trigger 12 being provided, at its cup-side end, with a peripheral projection 22 acting as an abutment for the spring element 13 (see figure 2).

Regarding claim 20, Kwasny discloses the trigger 12 being provided, at its cup-side end, with a sealing seat 23 having the form of a circumferential projection (see

Art Unit: 3754

figures 3-5).

Regarding claim 21, Kwasny discloses the inner casing 7 and the membrane 8 being made from aluminum (see page 3 of translations).

Regarding claim 22, Kwasny discloses the spring cage 11 being provided with at least one cut- out 34 (see figure 6).

With respect to claim 25, the limitation, " for liquid two-component systems, in particular two-component sealing foams, two- component glues or two-component coatings" , it is noted that "while features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwasny (WO 02/076852) in view of Leoncavallo (US 6,305,576).

With regards to claims 2 and 3, Kwasny discloses all elements of the claimed invention but is silent to the teaching of the membrane being glued and additionally screwed on to the inner casing.

Leoncavallo teaches a can or container for holding, dispensing and mixing at least two components including a membrane 42 glued or adhesively secured to an inner casing 30, wherein the membrane 42 is additionally screwed on to the inner casing 30 via cap 48 to help secure and retain the seal (see figure 1 and column 4, lines 21-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the device of Kwasny with a membrane being glued and additionally screwed on to the inner casing, as taught by Leoncavallo, in order to provide the inner casing with a securely affixed seal.

Regarding claim 4, Kwasny discloses the inner casing 7 being provided, at its extreme end, with a receptacle 18 for securing it to the spring case 11 (see figure 6).

Regarding claim 6, Kwasny discloses the receptacle 18 and a spring case 11 being clinched together (see figure 6).

Regarding claim 7, Kwasny discloses the free end of the receptacle 18 being placed over an outer circumferential projection of the spring cage 11 (see figure 7).

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwasny (WO 02/076852) and Leoncavallo (US 6,305,576), in view of Lipske et al. (US 3,425,589).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, the combination of Kwasny and Leoncavallo discloses the claimed invention but is silent to the glue being a two-component glue that is a cross-linking epoxy/amine system or a polyisocyanate/hardener system.

Lipske teaches it is common to use a two component adhesive system i.e. epoxy/amine in which two single composition adhesives are used, one which adheres to a metal substrate and to the second adhesive, and the second of which adheres to a plastic and to the first adhesive providing a strong seal impermeable to the passage of air or other gas and unaffected by pressure or vacuum (see column 5, lines 47-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the combination device of Kwasny and Leoncavallo with a glue being a two-component glue that is a cross-linking epoxy/amine system or a polyisocyanate/hardener system, as taught by Lipske, in order to provide a strong seal impermeable to the passage of air or other gas and unaffected by pressure or vacuum.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pauls (US 4,769,395), Kaufeler (US 4,750,165), Kindt (US 7,270,233), Moscovitz (US 6,533,113), Hildebrandt (US 4,962,853) and Meuresch et al. (US 4,613,061) show other devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT K. NICHOLS II whose telephone number is (571)270-5312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert K Nichols II/
Examiner, Art Unit 3754

/Kevin P. Shaver/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3754

Application/Control Number: 10/539,459
Art Unit: 3754

Page 9